

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1860.

NO. 22

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our paucity, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE AMERICAN OLIGARCHY—WHEREIN LIES ITS STRENGTH?

A Problem for Solution.

—DO—

NUMBER TWO.

We have seen that the three hundred thousand slaveholders do not rule the nation by the power of the purse, for they are comparatively poor: nor by their numbers, for they are a petty minority, nor at the ballot-box, where they poll but twelve votes against more than twenty-nine;—nor by the "three fifths apportionment," which still leaves to the non-slaveholding States, the controlling majority of both Houses of Congress, and a majority of the electoral College that elects the President and Vice President—the "three-fifths" apportionment which, if relinquished by liberating the slaves, would greatly increase the political vote of the South.

How then, the question returns—how is it, that the slaveholders bear rule?

"By the compromises of the Constitution,"—shout the politicians of all parties, in full chorus.—And what of the compromises of the Constitution,—what are they? And how do they enable the three hundred thousand slaveholders to bear rule? Those are said to be the Fugitive clause, the Foreign slave trade clause, (now expired,) and the "three fifths" clause which, as we have showed, leaves the non-slaveholding States in possession of the Government.

Admitting, for the argument's sake, that all these compromises exist, and that they mean all the slaveholders claim them to mean, (which is admitting what is not true,) it remains that not one of them, nor all of them combined, give the slaveholders the control of the country. The "three fifths" clause does not; the fugitive clause does not; and certainly the defunct restriction of power, for twenty years, up to 1808, over the importation of slaves, does not.

Nor is there anything in the Constitution which gives either the slaveholders or the South, their disproportionate power in the Nation. The Constitution nowhere provides, that the Slave States shall have the President and the Administration in their hands, three-fourths, or seven-eighths of the time! It no-where says, that the principal offices shall almost continually be given to the slaveholders, or to such as they may see fit to designate! Wherever the fault of the facts in this direction may lie, they do not lie in the Constitution. No one pretends it. The slaveholders do not claim it. Among all the pretended "compromises" and "guarantees" of the Constitution, these are never enumerated, and no forced expositions or interpretations, are ever resorted to, for this end. On the other side, no anti-slavery opponent of the Constitution discovers any ground of complaint in this direction.

It is neither the wealth, then, of the slaveholders, nor

their numerical strength, nor anything contained in the Constitution, that constitutes them an oligarchy, or that clothes them with power, or that places the sceptre of control over twenty-eight or thirty millions of people, in their hands!

What is it, then?

Some have said that the three hundred thousand slaveholders control the six millions of non-slaveholding whites of the South, and that, through these, the non-slaveholding States are controlled. And in confirmation of this, it is said that in the slave States, as in the nation, the basis of representation is made to rest partly on "three fifths" of the slaves.—But even this does not give the slaveholders a majority of the votes. For even estimating the slaveholding voters at 300,000,* the whole estimated number of slaveholders, which is too much, (many women and minors who cannot vote, being reckoned among the slaveholders), we have, as estimated in our first number, 1,200,000 voters of the South, of whom only 300,000 would be slaveholders, leaving 900,000 non-slaveholding voters, three times as many of the latter as of the former, making the former only one fourth of the whole.

But how came it to pass, that the petty minority of less than 300,000 dictated the "three-fifths" apportionment in some or all of the slave States?

How comes it to pass, that the minority control the majority? Why is it that the non-slaveholders vote only for slaveholders, or those whom they may designate?

And, besides, the control of the voters of the South, leaves them still in a minority of the nation, as has already been shown. So that we do not discover the locks of the Sampson, in that direction. The power does not lie there. These are only the effects of the power, not the cause, a part of the edifice, not the foundation.

But it may be said that the non-slaveholders of the South, are "servile;" and those of the North are "dough-faces," and here lies the secret! The facts are as stated. But whence came the facts? We are still among the symptoms and have not approached the cause of them.

The scramble for office, it is said, makes the Northern politicians servile.—True.—But how came the offices to be in the hands of the three hundred slaveholders? That is the question. Why are they not in the hands of the nearly four millions of voters in the United States, all of them non-slaveholders, except the three hundred thousand slaveholders, a proportion of thirty-seven to three; and the voters of the Free States, in the comparison of those of the South, being about as twenty-nine to twelve? How is it that the three slaveholding voters control the thirty-seven non-slaveholding voters? How is it that the twelve slave State voters control the twenty-nine Free State voters? Why are not the offices that the politicians desire, in the gift of the non-slaveholders and of the North, instead of the slaveholders and the South?

The real secret of slaveholding supremacy, still eludes our search, among the ballot boxes. It uses them, to be sure, but the power by which it uses them, lies beyond.

The "reign of terror" at the South, it is said, seals the lips of the non-slaveholders, and of any of the slaveholders who may be tired of the system. It forbids them even to speak—much more does it forbid them to vote. The facts are not to be disputed. But they are not the facts we are looking after. How is it that the three slaveholders maintain a "reign of terror" over the nine non-slaveholders? Especially, how is this done, when a portion of the slaveholders are among the persons silenced? And especially, how is this done in the presence of four millions of

* We have spoken of the number of the slaveholders as 300,000. The last census put them down at 347,525; but this includes the more slave hirers who are not owners. Mr. Helper estimates the slaveholders at only 186,551. So we have been exceedingly liberal in our computations, and can afford to be.

slaves, and free people of color? How is it done by the little minority of slaveholders, while they themselves are in constant fear, trembling at a leaf, sleeping with dirks and revolvers under their pillows, and with their bed-rooms well-stored with rifles, axes, and bludgeons? What sorcery is it that keeps the vast majority of "our brethren of the South," quiet and docile, under a "reign of terror" imposed upon them by the trembling and imbecile few?

One is half tempted to deny the facts, and to say, as some have lately said, that there is no such controlling oligarchy lording it over the nation—no such reign of terror, no such despotism at the South, as has been described. But there the facts stand, nevertheless.

But the "ignorance of the masses of the non-slaveholding whites at the South," is supposed to make them servile. But are they more servile than the educated classes at the North? Who are more servile than our Northern literati, our authors, our reviewers, our editors, our orators, our principal clergy?

Ignorance at the South, is doubtless a great obstacle to the abolition of slavery. But would you enlighten that ignorance by our New York Observers? Would you rouse them to action against slavery, by the speeches of our Republican Senators, pledging themselves and their party, to "let slavery alone in the States where it already exists?" Would this cure them of servility? Or could it be done by making them acquainted with the whole history of our statesmanship, in relation to the slavery question, our disclaimers, our compromises, our prudent avoidance of reducing to practice, the principles which we admit to be truthful, self-evident, and divinely revealed, for our guidance? Suppose the "masses of the non-slaveholding whites of the South" were, to-day, completely under the influence of the educated non-slaveholding whites of the North, and stood ready to follow their lead, both in political and ecclesiastical matters, how much progress would thereby be made, toward the deliverance of the nation from the control of the slave power? Cassius M. Clay is well educated, but what good would it do for the masses of the ignorant non-slaveholding whites of the South, to follow his lead? Read his late speeches, and consider.

And, besides all this, the ignorance of the non-slaveholding whites of the South, is primarily owing to the very evil whose Genesis and foundation stones we are searching after. The ignorance of the Southern masses is the effect of slavery, not its cause—it is one of the symptoms, not the disease. Slavery creates ignorance, and so long as it exists perpetuates ignorance, and uses it for its own ends.

Once more. The secret of the slaveholder's power, in and over this country, is confidently attributed to the corrupted religion of the country, to its pro-slavery religious teachers and writers, to its religious fellowship with slaveholders.—That the facts alleged exist and operate, cannot, alas, be denied! The deadly influences thus put forth cannot be computed, and can scarcely be exaggerated. They underlie the ignorance, the servility, the legislation, the jurisprudence that support slavery. More than all of them put together, they perpetuate slavery. The mention of this cause, comes nearer to the roots of the great cause we are searching after, than any that have been mentioned before it. And yet, it is not, of itself, that cause. If it be the great wheel that moves all the machinery of this complicated iniquity and destruction, there is nevertheless, a motor, a power, by which this great wheel is itself moved.

A corrupted Church and ministry, support slavery. But it was slavery that corrupted both the ministry and the Church. Slavery must have existed and operated with a controlling power over human society, before the Church and ministry could have come under its corrupting and controlling influence.

We find, then, the phenomenon of an all controlling slave power, an oligarchy strong enough to corrupt the religion of the country, to bring it under to control, to wield it for its own ends, prior to the support it now receives from it, in return.

The question is still before us, wherein lay that great power? The Sampson was full-grown that could thus seize, bind, and drive to service at its bidding, on its plantation, the religion of an intelligent nation, with the Bible in its hands.

The question before us, is, from whence did slavery, or, if you please, the slaveholders, GET THE POWER that enabled them to bind the Church and clergy hand and foot, and harness them up in their service?

Was it their overpowering numbers? No. They are an insignificant minority of the nation. Was it their great wealth? No. They are poor, compared with vastly larger numbers of non-slaveholders.

Imagine any other body of three hundred thousand citizens, in a nation of 25 or 30 millions, with a wealth of \$6,666,666-100 a piece, invested in some other property than slaves; say horses, oxen, elephants, dry-goods, farms, bank stock, or manufacturing machinery, and would that capital give them power to control the principal Churches, and chief ministers of the country? No such thing!

Suppose three hundred thousand of our citizens, instead of going or sending to Africa, and kidnapping and importing human beings, should have gone, or sent to some foreign country, and seized by robbery and violence, two thousand millions of dollars value of property, in cattle or merchandise, and imported it into the country, dividing it among themselves an average of \$6,666 66-100 a piece. Do you think that that amount of property thus procured, would have given them such a standing and influence in this country, that our learned clergy would write treatises in justification or palliation of it, adducing the precedent of Abraham's taking the spoils of the heathen nations round about him? Would they welcome the plunderers into their Churches? Would those of them who edited religious newspapers, even including those who professed to be opposed to "the system," decline saying that the practice was "inherently sinful?"

More especially, could the three hundred thousand citizens continue to do this, daily, yearly, and from generation to generation, if, instead of going or sending abroad for their booty, they plundered it by force of arms, by rifles, whips, thumb-screws, and fetters, from native born American inhabitants, in their own neighborhoods, at their own doors, in the light of day, claiming the right of thus robbing them because, forsooth, their fathers and grandfathers, had thus robbed the fathers and grandfathers of their victims, before them?

But all this is a very faint picture, an inadequate representation, a defective counterpart of the villainy enacted by the slaveholders of this country, inasmuch as the stealing of legitimate "human property,"—as Grotius observes, is less criminal than stealing "those, who in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant, lords of the earth."

And yet, our clergy and Churches, who would shudder at the lesser theft, can hold fellowship with the greater?

Whence is this unprecedented power of slaveholders beyond the power of any other class of human beings, to control everything in the nation wherein they are tolerated,—Church, clergy, religion, law, government, legislation, jurisprudence, literature, language,—the souls and bodies, not of their slaves merely, but of the whole nation? Can anyone tell? Can anyone solve this most wonderful problem; this deeper mystery than the mysteries of human nature in any other direction?

† See number one, of these articles.

The pro-slavery presses are very fond in asking why a slaveholder has not the right to carry "his property" wherever his business or his pleasure calls him. This question is answered in the true Yankee fashion by asking another, and the following; "Why can't I carry my property where I please?" as the man said with two polecats in a basket and a pound of assafetida in each pocket trying to force his way into a ball room.

Many have suffered by talking, but few by silence.

WAY-MARKS IN THE MORAL WAR WITH SLAVERY.

BY HENRY T. CHEEVER.

NUMBER VIII.

To those who watch the signs of the times, and who notice the changes which are taking place in the position of public men and journals, upon the great questions of the day, it is interesting to observe how they are driven from one cover to another, in their vain efforts to play the double game of denying abolitionism, while professing to be anti-slavery.*

When the Church Anti-slavery Society was formed, one year ago, upon a distinct platform of principle, declaring the practice of slaveholding essentially sinful and anti-Christian, and to be dealt with as such, by Christian Churches and ministers; and declaring also the duty of one family or section of the visible Church, to rebuke and refuse fellowship to another the section of the visible Church, that denies the rights of man, and the common brotherhood of humanity, by defending slavery, and folding to its bosom, slave-sellers, slave buyers, and slaveholders, *The Independent*, without even quoting its Declaration of Principles, intimated that it was not easy to see what was the special mission or province of such a Society, and it has ever since steadily ignored its existence.

In December last, it had a supercilious *ex-cathedra* article, entitled "LOGICAL FALLACIES," aimed at those who hold to the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, or as *The Independent* and those of that way of thinking choose to express it—masking their meaning in Latin phrase—at those who hold slaveholding to be *malum in se*. Now, that the sophistries and fallacies of that article have been so thoroughly demonstrated by the *Maine Evangelist*, and it has been proven conclusively, how *The Independent* falls into the very fallacy which it portentously charges on those who hold to the inherent sinfulness of slavery and slaveholding, it staves off from a categorical answer to the plain question of the *Principia*; "Is it inherently sinful to hold human beings as slaves, under the system of slavery established in the U. S.?" with the evasion, "that the question whether sinfulness inheres in any substance or act, or can be predicated only of motives, is one of the most vexed questions of moral philosophy, and also that the definition of a slave is by no means settled in lexicography."

Has it then come to this, that after the existence of slavery, three hundred years in America, and the settlement of the status of a slave, by innumerable judicial decisions, "as one who is in the power of his master, to whom he belongs; who can do nothing, possess nothing, and acquire nothing but what must belong to his master," and after the long existing, and undeniable dictionary meaning of a slave, "as a person who is wholly subject to the will of another; who has no freedom of action, but whose person and services are wholly under the control of another,"—has it come to this, that the *Independent* can get out of its uncomfortable corner, only by saying, that "the definition of a slave is by no means settled in lexicography?"

Let *The Independent*, then, know that *The Principia* will not let it out of its self-inclosed corners, until, like unfortunate cows that have lost their cud, it regains its thread of argument, by patiently ruminating upon the passage in Hebrews v. xii., which it commends to the *Principia*.

"For when, for the time, ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God: and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat."

It is little short of ludicrous to observe the shifts and turns, by which men will try to avoid the hated logical conclusion, that slaveholding is sinful in itself, if sinful at all.

In a published discourse, delivered at Greenville, Ct., by Rev. R. P. STANTON, entitled "slavery viewed in the light of the Golden Rule"—temperate, wise, and just, in most of its reasonings and conclusions,—there occurs, as if by interpolation, or after-thought, this specimen of fallacious reasoning, singularly weak and inconclusive.

"The doctrine that slavery is sinful in itself, is obviously false; for there are cases in which men may be justly deprived of personal liberty, as in the case of State prison convicts. So there are cases in which men may be justly deprived of their lives, as in the case of murderers."

Put into closer terms, his meaning is this: "It is false

and wrong to say that holding men as slaves, is sinful in itself, because, putting men into prison as convicts, is not sinful in itself, but is right; and because hanging men as murderers is not sinful, in itself, but right. As if there were any analogy between the condition and punishment of a man for a crime, by law, and seizing and holding, or buying and holding an innocent man as property, without law, by any irresponsible individual.

The fallacy in this reasoning lies in the false premise assumed, viz.: that slavery is mere deprivation of personal liberty. The argument put into a syllogism, is this: Slavery is mere deprivation of personal liberty; but convicts and murderers may be justly deprived of personal liberty; therefore slavery is not sinful in itself. As if you should say, the doctrine that murder is sinful in itself is obviously false; for there are cases in which men may be justly deprived of their lives." Here the fallacy in the reasoning lies in the assumed false premise, that slavery was the mere deprivation of personal liberty. In both cases, the falsehood in the premise vitiates the conclusion.

As you cannot reason, from the innocency in itself of taking the life of a murderer by law, to the innocency in itself of taking life by murder, no more can you reason from the innocency of depriving a convict of his liberty, by way of punishment, to the innocency in itself of depriving a man of his freedom, and using him for property as your slave.

The Independent answers (I should say evades) the question of the *Principia*, "Is it inherently sinful to hold human beings as slaves, under the system of slavery established in the United States," by saying, this depends entirely upon what is meant by a slave, or by inherently sinful; and then it adds in the next week's issue, that the question about inherent sinfulness is "one of the most vexed questions of moral philosophy," and also that the definition of a slave is by no means settled in lexicography!!

And so, alas! because the *Independent* cannot satisfy itself about the meaning of "inherently sinful," and in regard to the status of a human being indicated by the term slave, therefore, in deference to the conscientious scruples of "such teachers, whose ignorance of the first principles of the oracles of God prevents them from knowing that slaveholding, under the American system of slavery, is inherently sinful," we must not agitate this question "which marks a certain school of abolitionists!"

What abolitionist under heaven would ever have thought of qualifying the sinfulness of slavery, any more than the sinfulness of murder, by the term inherent, but for the fact that certain leading divines in this country, in the interest of slavery, first asserted that slavery is not sin in itself, is not *malum in se*, as a reason for not touching the sin of slaveholding in the church? Who would not have been satisfied with Wesley's honest definition of American slavery, as the sum of all villainies, if mealy-mouthed apologists for "the domestic institution" in the church, had not attempted to break the force of such a definition, by darkening counsel with words without knowledge, such as organic sin, and social sin, in distinction from individual and personal sin; and the distinction between an objective wrong, which is always and unchangeably wrong, and a subjective wrong, which is to be measured entirely by the circumstances of the individual committing it; and such other qualifying terms as benevolent slaveholding, involuntary slaveholding, Christian slaveholding, legal slaveholding, innocent slaveholding!

Professed anti-slavery men, who have themselves raised the outcry against abolitionists on account of the term, inherent sinfulness, as being a part of that "wordy warfare" which marks a certain school of abolitionists, would be glad enough now, when pressed in argument, to let that drop, and to wink out of sight the very metaphysical question which themselves started. But they will not succeed. Slavery, if destroyed at all, in this country, will be destroyed now, on the ground of the innate and essential sinfulness of the practice and the act of slaveholding. And the churches, in refusing fellowship to slaveholders, will do it on the ground lately taken by the Central Church (Prof. Shepard's) at Bangor, viz:

Resolved, That every person sustaining the legal relation of a master to a slave, who claims that a slave is rightfully his property, and uses him as an article of property for his own gain, freely giving his support and consent to the system of American slavery as good and right, is guilty of etc.

duct incompatible with the religion of Christ, and is not entitled to Christian fellowship, nor to recognition as a Christian minister.

It is to be noted in these *Way-Marks* how the churches are fast coming to this. And although the *New York Evangelist* may continue to refuse articles upon the *Church Anti-Slavery Society*, on the ground that "it is unwilling by discussion to educate its readers into the principles of that platform," and although the *Independent* may dismiss it, or still keep it at bay, by saying, "We cannot oblige the *Principia*, by entering into that wordy warfare, which marks a certain school of abolitionists,"—the discussion will go on, and the truth will be elicited. And if it be a principle in the ethics of some men, that forbids them saying that slavery is *malum in se*, that principle, they may be sure, will be canvassed and controverted.

Meantime, we have reason to know that many of the "silent democracy of the Church" ask one another, why should *Evangelist* and *Independent* (to say nothing of the *Observer* which may be charitably supposed to be all absorbed in pondering the Premium Questions with which it has been lately plied), why should these so persistently ignore even the existence of the *Church Anti-Slavery Society*; which has been called into being by the Providence of God and the necessity of the times; which is free from all sectarian bias or sectional antipathies; and which simply labors to evoke, and give volume, and intensity to the solemn protest of Christianity in every sect, against the longer continuance of American slavery?

God is using this Society as a touch-stone to the churches, whereby to make visible the hostility of His *real* church to slavery, in all denominations, and to concentrate that hostility and give it power. The mightiest benevolent Societies of the country, and its largest ecclesiastical organizations, are verily guilty before God, in reference to the attitude of slavery at the present time. Nor can they maintain favor much longer with the people, if they do not go, practically and earnestly, against this great wickedness.

The writer of this, solemnly believes, if there be not a speedy change in their attitude toward the "giant crime of the day," that some of the dearest present organizations and agencies of the Church will either be crippled and crushed under the weight of their sin of omission, and their refusing to REMEMBER THEM THAT ARE IN BONDS AS BOUND WITH THEM; or as has been intimated by the *Chicago Herald* to the American Board, will have "to halt in some of her magnificent enterprises, until she accepts the issue which she has hitherto evaded, and within her proper sphere bears her proper testimony and performs her powerful part, under God, in the cause of liberty, humanity, and a truer 'Christian civilization,' than she has achieved among the Choctaws;—the genuine missionary work, Christ-like in its benevolence, and in which all Christian agencies in the land, each in its place, are called to co-operate, of removing the heel of oppression from the neck of our prostrate colored brother, and reinstating him in the full possession of his birthright in the Family of Man."

We are often reminded of a passage in a letter from a gentleman of the West, communicated for the *Principia*, of December 17, to which your readers, who keep files of the paper, may refer. They will find it to contain a historical sketch of the original character and downward course of the *N. Y. Observer* and the *Evangelist*, and closing with the inquiry whether the *Independent* does not show signs of going in the same direction.

For the *Principia*.

THE INDEPENDENT AND OBSERVER.

Mr. Editor: I have been looking for the response of the *New York Observer* to the questions propounded, some time since, by the *Independent*, respecting the righteousness of slaveholding, &c. But the *Observer* is so busy, looking after the great New England apostasy, that it will not probably find time, at present. Besides, I imagine the editor has no taste for that "wordy warfare which marks a certain school of abolitionists." I thought, at first, that the questions were so specific that they might readily be answered, according to the *Independent's* request, by a simple "Yes or No." But on the whole, I think it would not be safe for the *Observer* to do so. The majority of the questions relate to the *acts* of the master or the rights of the slave. If you will reprint two or three of the shortest of these questions, I will give you my reasons why they cannot be thus answered.

- "1. Is it wrong to sell human beings guiltless of crime?"
- "2. Is it wrong to hold human beings, as property, subject to be bought and sold?"
- "3. Is it wrong to separate, by force or law, husbands and wives, parents and children, &c.?"

Now these questions relate only to *acts*. Does not the *Independent* know that "it is one of the most vexed questions in moral philosophy 'whether sinfulness inheres in any substance or act, or can be predicated only of motives?'" To sell or hold human beings as property or to separate families with a *wrong* motive, is no doubt wrong. But if he holds them as property because "he is invested by the law of Virginia with property in slaves" and stands between them and oppressive laws, "and throws the whole weight of his influence against the system," and if he buys or sells or separates families, if need be, for the same purpose, where is the wrong? And then, as to whether it be a crime to forbid the slaves to read the Bible, or violate their chastity, does it depend on the motives? Does the sin, if any, "inhere" in the act, or can it be predicated only of the motives? Is it *malum in se*? Evidently, the *Independent* ought to have asked the *Observer*, whether it was wrong to do these things with a *wrong* motive, before demanding a simple "Yes or No."

And then; there are other considerations in the case, which ought to prevent all rashness of opinion. The laws of Moses apparently allowed a man to "sell" his children as servants. Let us not seem to run against the Bible, which is thought to sanction some sort of slavery. Besides, the definition of the word *property* "is by no means settled in lexicography." Webster gives nearly a dozen different definitions or shades of meaning. One is, "that to which a person has the legal title, whether in possession or not." Is the "mere legal relation" sinful?

And then, as to the slave's right to read the Bible, &c. It "depends entirely on what is meant" by *rights*; whether *moral* or *legal* rights. They have no legal rights, such as are supposed, and it is "a question by no means settled" how far or in what respects, a man's duty or natural rights may be modified by any seeming conflict between human statutes and God's law.

As the *Independent* maintains that slaveholding is not sinful except the motive be wrong, and as we all know that if there is any sin in the case, it is in the *holding*; and as any other act is sinful if done with a *wrong* motive,—I beg leave to suggest that, for the future, it were better to let men's *acts* alone, and attend only to their *motives*.

DANIEL.

P. S. I like the *Independent* in many respects, but it needs a little pricking, to prevent over inflation.

D.

REMARK. If any thing were needed to show up the inconsistency of the *Independent* in this matter, and the uselessness of any contest against such pro slavery papers as the *N. Y. Observer* without affirming the "inherent sinfulness of slaveholding," the keen but good humored irony of our correspondent should suffice. Let us hope that the day is not far distant when all who do not mean to defend the slave system as innocent, will proclaim, consistently, the inherent sinfulness of *slaveholding*. There can be no tenable middle ground.—(Ed. *Principia*.)

For "The Principia."

PRO-SLAVERY BELCHINGS REBUKED.

Mr. Editor.—I am sure that the readers of the *Principia* will be glad to see that a merited rebuke has been administered by the *Boston Congregationalist*, to the author of the slander in regard to the call for the late meeting in Philadelphia, in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, which appeared in the *Philadelphia Ledger*.

It seems that a writer with the same signature ('O. P. Q.') communicated to the *Congregationalist* an account of the "Convention of Business Men's Prayer Meetings" in Philadelphia, which fell upon the same week with the Church Anti-Slavery Meeting. It was doubtless, because the christian and courteous call for such a meeting would get before some of the Southern members of that Convention, that such ire was awakened in the mind of "O. P. Q." He feared that Southern merchants would think Business Men's Prayer Meetings favored a meeting in behalf of the slave. *Illinc haec Lachrymae*. Hence those crocodile tears at the doings of "traitors and conspirators to the cause of our glorious Union!" The craft was in danger. It was the "controverted subject" stealing into a Business Men's Prayer Meet-

ing! That would never do. The Convention must be purged of that heresy, cost what it might, even though it endangered O. P. Q.'s claim to the standing of a gentleman, saying nothing of the honor and reputation of a christian. But I will not detain the reader from the *Congregationalist's* view of O. P. Q.'s elegant deliverance of himself:

"We notice by our Exchanges, that at one of the Noon-day Prayer Meetings held in Philadelphia recently, a brief circular was found distributed in the house, calling attention to a meeting to be held in the city, in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society. Whereupon 'O. P. Q.' (we hope it is not our correspondent above) felt himself called upon to send a communication to the *Public Ledger*, making most intemperate and abusive charges against the authors and circulators of the call, and consigning them to an 'apprenticeship of six months on a tread-mill by day, and to be fed with bread and water, and sleep on straw, till their fanatical and be-crazed brains had time to get cool.'"

"It is to be hoped, for the honor and reputation of the church, that this 'O. P. Q.' doesn't profess to be a christian, as he certainly cannot, with any show of propriety, claim to be a gentleman. Whatever may be thought of the method taken to notify the meeting, there can be but one opinion, as it seems to us, of the head and the heart of a man, who would stoop to belch out such abuse and vituperation against a christian brother, as is embodied in the paragraphs signed O. P. Q. in the *Ledger*."

H. T. C.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

It is painful to record such "signs of the times" as the following. A republic in which bribery prevails is nigh to destruction. And yet, who can fail to see that a republic in which office is sought for the spoils, and offices held for the chances afforded for emolument, is on the high way to open bribery? Class legislations, and parties founded on them, are indications of the same character. The man that votes for them is already bribed. The notion that the voter must needs vote the party ticket and the nominated candidates, as a choice of evils, is the notion, either of the necessity of bribing the devil, or of the feasibility of bribing Divine Providence. Voters with such notions are ready to offer and accept bribes, to and from one another. For proof and illustration, read the news:

Special Dispatch to the New York Times.

PROVIDENCE, Wednesday, April 4, 1860.

Beyond a doubt, the combined Democratic and Conservative Republican ticket is successful in this State. The greatest excitement has attended the election, and every device which party tactics could suggest has been employed by both parties to secure their success.

The open purchase of votes has been a remarkable feature of the day. The voters when led up to the ballot-box, would with one hand drop the ticket, and with the other receive the bribe. The negro vote rated high, some colored brethren receiving \$50 each. Individuals of comparative wealth declined to vote unless paid to do so. Voters publicly put themselves up for purchase. Bids would commence at \$10, and run up to \$50.

Great good-humor and merriment prevailed all day. The excitement was intense. Bands of music, banners, decorated wagons, and hired conveyances of every description, paraded the streets from early morning till night.

The announcement of Padelford's unsuccessful attempt to bribe the Town Clerk of Cranston undoubtedly lost him a large vote. The action of the Democrats and Conservatives has been united; that of the Republicans has been divided.

It is estimated that \$150,000 has been spent. Large amounts have been bet on the result. The odds have been in favor of Sprague. Padelford men have shown a disposition to hedge.

In other towns, wholesale bribery was even more open and outrageous.

The disposition among many Republicans to vote for Turner was counteracted by a notice from him requesting them to adhere to the party.

Bonfires, cannon, liquor and excitement abound. The Democrats are rejoicing that, with their registry taxes all paid by the Union party, they will go into the Presidential fight stronger than ever.

Good order has been maintained throughout. Everybody drinks, but everybody appears to be used to it.

PORTVILLE, Cattaraugus Co., April 9, 1860.

Yesterday, at 9 a. m., we had a smart hail storm for a few minutes, the hail stones being of the size of large peas. At about 10 o'clock, similar stones, collected into masses of the size of Hickory nuts, commenced falling, rapidly increasing in number and size, until there was a dense shower of them. Thousands of them were as large as hen's eggs, but so loosely connected that they flattened like snow balls on striking a roof or the hard ground. They came with great force, but so nearly perpendicular, that little damage was done. Plenty of these balls could be picked up after the shower, three inches in diameter, and three-fourths of an inch thick, and containing perhaps a hundred hailstones.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1860.

REIGN OF TERROR EXTENDING.

We are living in portentous times. At the South, nobody is safe, or has been, for months. The persecution raised against Radical Abolitionists, is in process of being extended to Republicans, and their denunciations of the Radicals affords them no security. In North Carolina, a venerable minister of the Gospel is sentenced to one year's imprisonment for the alleged crime of having given circulation to a book showing the superior profitableness of free over slave labor. In another State a juror disagrees with his fellow jurors, on a point of law or evidence, and must flee the State for his life. For the crime of color, whole families are exiled from their native State, on penalty of being enslaved. Missionaries of the Gospel, with their flocks, are driven from their stations and their homes, for propagating the Gospel as held by Wesley, Hopkins, and the Presbyterian and the Methodist Episcopal Churches of the last century. In Congress, freedom of speech is exercised at the hazard of life. The Senate, by the votes of Republican, as well as Democratic Senators, incarcerates Dr. Hyatt, without judge, jury, trial, or hearing, unconvicted and unaccused of any offence against the laws. And the deed finds Republican apologists, as well as Democratic advocates.

But the Reign of Terror is not confined to the South. The slave-driver, with his manacles, is already in Massachusetts, and puts them on the wrists, not of Mr. Keitt's slaves on *Bunker Hill*, but on those of a white citizen of Concord. The insulted sovereignty of Massachusetts interposes, only upon a legal technicality, a lawyer's quibble, the jeer, no doubt, of the Federal judges, to liberate her outraged son—not daring to stand on her own rights, as a free Sovereign State, owing no allegiance to the three hundred thousand men-stealers.

The driver is already in the Free Northwest, hunting his white victims. *Booth* is in prison. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin, hears the lash over its head, and quails under it.

The driver is in New York city, flourishing his whip at Dr. Chover, in the shadow of his own pulpit, in the society of the Church of the Puritans. The other evening he was there, and stayed till midnight, challenging the votes of paying and attending Church members, thrusting in the votes of seceders absentees, and enemies,—attempting to alter the Society's pew-deeds, and elect Trustees opposed to the Pastor. On that occasion, he was outvoted, and three friends of the Pastor, Messrs. Hart, Whiting, and Hall, were declared duly elected, by the Inspectors, who were opposed to them. But the driver abides by no decision, submits to no defeat, sticks at no measures. The driver is there again. The Inspectors refuse certificates of election to the Trustees they had declared elected, and grant certificates to other men, who were not elected. But a justice of the Supreme Court grants an injunction, restraining the bogus Trustees from exercising their functions.

What will the driver next do? Will he crack his whip over the head of Judge Bonny of the Supreme Court? Why not, as well as over the Supreme Court of Wisconsin?

Seriously, where are we? Who is safe? What citizen shall next be seized and manacled? Who next incarcerated in prison?

And what are Abolitionists doing? What are anti-slavery men doing? What are Republicans doing?

Cassius M. Clay repeats again and again, in every variety of form, the dogma, that Radical Abolitionists, for the heresy of denying the legality of slavery, have forfeited the right of free speech, and should, by statute law, be restrained from its exercise, or banished. The Republicans of New York City propose by acclamation, his nomination for the Presidency. They pass resolutions applauding him, and without a word of censure for his proscription of Radical Abolitionists. Have any of the Republican, or moderately anti-slavery Religious Journals, uttered a word of rebuke for his proscription, or of dissent from it? We have found none—not even in *The Independent* or *The Tribune*. Is the proscriptive dogma to go unquestioned, unrebuked, except by the intended victims, as in the pro-slavery mobs, in this city and elsewhere, in 1833-4?

While Booth is imprisoned at Milwaukee, by the slave power, for the alleged crime of sheltering fugitive slaves, preparations are making for the Republican Nominating Con-

vention at Chicago, and the claims of the rival candidates are being eagerly canvassed. Among them all, is there one that can be depended upon to exert himself for a repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill? Is there one that can be depended upon to protect Radical Abolitionists in the right to exercise freedom of speech, and of the Press? Cassius M. Clay, certainly, cannot be. And the Tribune's favorite candidate, Mr. Bates, commends himself by advocating a more rigorous enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and, it need be, the enactment of a more stringent and severe one. All such acts are directly aimed at Radical Abolitionists, and are designed to persecute them for conforming their conduct to the precepts and the religion of Jesus Christ.

We are looking for a darker, and a still darker reign of terror, over the entire North, unless Radical Abolitionists, distinctly and avowedly such, awake at once, and, in some way, make themselves heard and felt. How shall they do it? By voting for those who persecute them? Or who have no rebukes for those who do?

A reign of terror is impending over us, and none the less imminent will be the danger, on the accession of the party of Edward Bates and Cassius M. Clay. What reader of history, what student of human nature, does not know, that the firm and honest advocates of Radical truth, whether political or religious, have more to fear from the parties and sects that first court them, seemingly assimilate to them, and finally diverge and apostatize from them, than from their open and original enemies? Whose influence do the Radical Abolitionists of Kentucky, suffer so much from, to-day, hunted and exiled and plundered, as from that of Cassius M. Clay?

"MORE NONSENSE."

Under the above caption, which we deem quite appropriate, the *N. Y. Times* gives utterance to the "nonsense" that follows:

MORE NONSENSE.—Mr. Thaddeus Hyatt has offered \$300, it is said, in prizes for essays on the powers of Congress to compel persons to testify before Committees of Inquiry. We are sorry, if this be true, to find that Mr. Hyatt is about to add the folly of wasting his money to the folly of a fruitless martyrdom. Prize essays rarely contain anything either new or very striking, and, in this instance, they would be more than ordinarily worthless. The powers of Congress in the matter of summoning witnesses, as well as in every other matter, can only be ascertained in one way, and that is by judicial decisions; and this right which he contests has never come before the Courts either in this country or in England without being solemnly confirmed. He might just as well offer a prize for the best essay on the right of the Supreme Court of this State to issue a writ of *habeas corpus*. If he wishes to secure that most valuable of possessions—a fair reputation for common sense—he will make a clean breast of it to the Committee, and return peacefully to the bosom of his family.

Did the editor of the *New York Times* never hear of public opinion, as a power in the world, controlling legislation and jurisprudence? Did he never hear of the press as an instrument for enlightening and guiding public opinion? Did he never read history? Did he never hear of Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, nor of his decision in the *Somerset* case, which abolished slavery in England, and led to the Acts of Parliament for abolishing the African Slave Trade, and afterwards, for abolishing slavery in the British West Indies? Is he ignorant of the fact that there was a period in which that same Lord Chief Justice Mansfield was a mere tool and mouth-piece of the slaveholders and slave importers, the very Judge Taney of his country, whose repeated decisions in favor of negro-chattelhood were regarded the law of the land, being the decisions of the Court of King's bench, the "Supreme Court" of Great Britain? Is he ignorant that, in his pro-slavery decisions, Lord Chief Justice Mansfield was sustained by the Great Blackstone, until a power arose before whom, after a long struggle, the united forces of the slave dealers, slaveholders, Lord Mansfield and Blackstone were compelled to succumb? Has he never learned who it was that wielded that power, and the means and instrumentalities that he employed? Did he never hear of Granville Sharpe? nor of his essays on the powers of Parliaments, Courts, Judges, Constitutions and valid law? Has he never learned that it was the power of those essays that moved the people of Great Britain, the Christians and the Christian ministry of Great Britain, as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind?

Does the editor of the *Times* know how it comes to pass that the slavery question in America has come to overha-

dow every other political and ecclesiastical question? Has he never heard of the great Whig party, of its overthrow, its Daniel Webster and its Henry Clay falling with it and under its ruins? Or, knowing it, has he never listened to the wailings and curses of the discomfited politicians and editors, standing afar off, and mourning that, in one hour, so great a party had come to naught, through the influence of the petty papers and "prize essays" that had been levelled against their idols?

Had the *Times* been published in the days of Granville Sharpe, it would have doubtless enlightened its readers upon "the nonsense" of circulating "essays which rarely contain any thing new or very striking" just as the leading Whig papers of this city, up to within six days of the overthrow of the Whig party, derided the "nonsense" and the "worthlessness" of the armour wielded against it?

Seriously. The lessons of history, of experience and observation, as well of philosophy and religion seem to be all lost, on a class of editors too wise to learn, or too self-indulgent to incur the fatigue of thinking. The noblest instances of heroic endurance, for the benefit of mankind, have no attractions for such. They would have prated of "the folly of a fruitless martyrdom" had they witnessed the sufferings of the friends of freedom in England, of the Puritans, of the Protestant Reformers, and of the primitive Christians.

We had almost forgotten to remind the editor who penned the article under review, that, on the first excitement produced by the Dred Scott decision, the *N. Y. Times* intimated the probability that that decision would revolutionize or break up the existing political parties. Now that the fruits of that unrighteous decision are beginning to overleap their original boundaries, and, from ignoring the Constitutional rights of the "African race," are sweeping away those of our white citizens, without even the forms of law or the poor pretense of a mock trial, the *N. Y. Times* derides "the folly of useless martyrdom" and of "wasting money" for prize essays on the subject.

POLITICAL COLONIZATIONISM.—The Anti-slavery Bugle (Salem, O.) of March 31, calls attention to "a probable plank in the Chicago platform," to wit, the Colonization of the Free people of color, "on the same ground upon which the American Colonization Society bases its operations" viz: the essential distinction of the races, the invincibility of the prejudice of the whites against the blacks. The Bugle justifies its apprehensions by copious quotations from Republican orators and editors, namely: Frank P. Blair, Senator Trumbull, Senator Wade, Judge Bates, the Washington Republic, the *N. Y. Evening Post*, the *N. Y. Tribune*, the Ohio State Journal, the Danville Republican, the Missouri Republican Convention, and Governor Dennison.

The list should have been headed by extracts from Wm. H. Seward's famous speech at Oswego, during the Campaign of 1856, published with commendations in the *National Era*, the next winter—one of the most virulent tirades against the negro, ever uttered, the precursor and doubtless the provocative, (as a matter of partisan rivalry), of Judge Taney's Dred Scott obiter dictum.

Well. We can only say that if the Chicago Convention makes that plunge for the companionship of the expatriation Legislatures of the South, rebuked by Southern Judges, and vetoed by southern Governors, (for it is nonsense to talk of colonization without compulsion) the question will fairly be presented to our "least of two evils" men, whether it is not best to vote for the Democrats to keep down the Republicans.

THAT PERSONAL LIBERTY BILL.

What has become of the Personal Liberty bill in the *N. Y. Legislature*? The session is wearing away. Is there not danger that the action of the House will be again delayed so long that the Senate will again have the excuse of want of time to act upon it? Conservatism in the Republican party may fear to pass the bill, lest it should occasion a loss of votes at the coming Presidential election. But can they afford to risk the loss of votes from the earnest friends of human freedom? There are good and true men in the Assembly who, we trust, will do what they can to secure early action.

A thousand probabilities will not make one truth.

Hon. Ov
against sla
est manne
moved tow
slaveholder
his friends
signs of vic

SENATOR
petition
and restore
and slave T
The Missou
Slaveholder
are the rul

REV. HE
Trustees of
against We
for it, on hi

ADMISSIO
the Union,
by a vote of
Messrs. Eng

FROM NO
of the N.
WORTH, is
the anti-sla

FROM W
is elected c
ciary for th
case.

In our last
Cassius M.
from the Sta
account from
communicati
a letter to th
and an addre
3, in the sam
tire, and foll
LETTER FROM

To the Editor
The secret
"Radicals" a
tucky, and a
lied upon the
patriotic pur
in good faith
trials of the
purposes of t
reaction again
wealth. The
constitutional
avoid all viol
and their ene
alleged was,
while I was,
well known t
include me in
of some of th
and the conse
they did not
through the
by us, they k
fort speech ra
al liberty, and
Everything th
turns, has be
and calumny
cal Abolition
the downfall o
J. G. Hans
to Kentucky,
published in
The mob again
was well know
while, and the
attended Sund
was known th
ment was got

HON. OWEN LOVEJOY, has delivered a scathing speech against slavery, in the House of Representatives. His earnest manner, and vigorous gesticulation, especially as he moved toward the other side, while speaking, roused the slaveholders, who rose up before him, and interrupted him: his friends gathered round him, and for a time there seemed signs of violence.

SENATOR TRUMBALL of Ohio, presented to the Senate a petition from citizens, asking Congress to allay agitation, and restore harmony, by establishing a line between free and slave Territory.—Referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Missouri compromise over again. Late in the day. Slaveholders keep no faith with non-slaveholders. They are the ruling caste.

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER who was absent when the Trustees of the Pilgrim Church closed their meeting house against Wendell Phillips, gave them so sound a castigation for it, on his return, that they resigned their offices.

ADMISSION OF KANSAS.—The Bill admitting Kansas into the Union, under her free Constitution, has passed the House by a vote of 134 to 73, only three Northern members, namely Messrs. English, Scott, and Sickles, voting in the negative.

FROM NORTH CAROLINA.—According to a correspondent of the N. Y. Tribune, the persecution of REV. DANIEL WORTH, is not likely to extinguish, but rather to increase the anti-slavery sentiment in North Carolina.

FROM WISCONSIN.—The Herald says that Judge Nixon is elected over Judge Sloan, which carries the State Judiciary for the Fugitive Slave Bill, in the Sherman Boothe case.

News of the Day.

THE CONFLICT IN KENTUCKY.

In our last paper, we recorded a letter of March 29, from CASSIUS M. CLAY concerning the efforts making to drive him from the State, and of the position he had taken—also a further account from Louisville, April 3, concerning the same. Further communications from Mr. Clay, have since come to hand, viz., a letter to the editors of the Louisville Journal, March 29th, and an address to the citizens of Madison County, dated April 3, in the same paper. The first of these, we here present entire, and follow it with some extracts from his address.

LETTER FROM CASSIUS M. CLAY—HE REPUDIATES ALL SYMPATHY WITH THE RADICALS.

WHITE HALL, Ky., March 29, 1860.

To the Editors of the Louisville Journal:

The secret purpose of the leaders of the attack upon the "Radicals" at Berea, was to suppress Republicanism in Kentucky, and aimed more especially at me. Knowing that I relied upon the justness of my cause, and the irreproachable and patriotic purposes of my whole action in the Commonwealth, I in good faith, cut myself away from the revolutionary doctrines of the "Radical Abolitionists," and the unfortunate purposes of those, who, in their persons, made an armed insurrection against the non-slaveholding whites of the Commonwealth. The proposition that the Legislature should, as it could constitutionally do, enact a law to meet the difficulty, and thus avoid all violence, was met by Radical Abolitionists of the North and their enemies here, with equal denunciation.* The reason alleged was, that it was useless to drive off those non-resistants whom I was left to agitate the slavery question! And it is well known that my personal and political enemies desired to include me in the proscription! Nothing but the friendship of some of the committee (when the proposition was made) and the conservatism of the country, prevented Finding that they did not get a safe opportunity to attack the Republicans through the Radicals, whom they supposed would be defended by me, they kept up their threats against me, till my Frankfort speech rallied around me all the true lovers of constitutional liberty, and thwarted for the time, their criminal designs. Everything that I have said offensive to the slaveholding interest, has been steadily paraded in the Press and elsewhere, and calumny added, both by the slaveholders, and the "Radical Abolitionists" of the North, to consummate my ruin, and the downfall of the cause of liberty here.

J. G. Hanson, one of the expelled Bereans, returned again to Kentucky, his native state, on the 3d day of this month, as published in a letter to the Centreville, (Ind.) Republican. The mob again threatened him but faintly, he retired, which was well known here in all circles, to the mountains for a while, and then was generally at Berea, having preached and attended Sunday School more than once. But so soon as it was known that I was in Berea on Saturday, a great excitement was got up, and stories circulated, that I was there, mar-

shalling my forces against the revolutionary tribunal. By Sunday night, the mob had taken the field, and on Monday brought on the collision at Berea, by "illegal search" of the houses of citizens there, without warrant, adding insult to injury, ostensibly to find Hanson, but in reality to raise a row, which they succeeded in doing, several being shot on both sides. And the Revolutionary Committee, driven back, rallied again on Tuesday, and finding no one, broke down that terrible thing—the saw-mill—and declared vengeance against me and the Republicans who were engaged in the fight. What was my true position? Standing on the doctrine of the Frankfort speech, I advised Mr. Hanson to leave the State, and thus save himself and my friends from the conflict, which I knew was premeditated by the Revolutionary Committee. On Sunday night I stayed at Kingston, where I stated the whole thing, and my message of peace to Berea, to several slaveholders. One of the Revolutionary Committee being present, I was then informed by that committee man, that they were "after me certainly"—that I "was the one wanted"; and it was currently reported that a special detachment had been sent to "take me" wherever found, which the said detachment was very careful not to do! At the same time, the old letter of protest, which Hanson wrote on the 10th inst., to Judge Field, was now talked of as being dictated by me, at Berea on Saturday, to stir up the community to madness, and execute vengeance upon me without time for truth or reflection. On Tuesday I was no doubt saved from this ruse only by timely taking the stump, and showing the true people of Madison, what I had really done; and that some of the mob knew the whole thing on Monday, and had suppressed it with a view to connect me with stirring up war in the State! That Committee well know, while I shall not defend the radicals in their mad purposes that I will not be driven into acquiescence in their usurped power, nor from the defence of all Republicans who are attacked in their persons or property because only of their Republicanism. They desire to renew the fable of the wolf and the lamb, and by the committal of outrages against my friends which I am pledged to resist, to consummate with a show of public justice, their own criminal designs against my life and cause. I publish these facts, that all honest men may not be deluded; that we may stand or fall upon our merits, and not be overwhelmed with clamor, which is the strong weapon of mob violence always. The Governor may make his demonstrations—the "Minnie rifle," and "cannon" may come on to extinguish the just indignation of outraged freemen, in vain. Standing upon the laws, the Constitution and our own patriot purposes, we shall not be intimidated by this new accession of power in the suppression of our rights. If civil war is begun, it will be begun against our most earnest implorations of the forbearance of friends, and most solemn protest against the aggressions of enemies against the common liberties of all! If blood be shed, it will not be first shed by us! If the States shall fly to arms, North and South, become involved in one common ruin, let those who shall begin the conflict, answer for the end.

C. M. CLAY.

* It will be noticed here, that C. M. Clay repeats the fact of his having proposed enactments to put down the Radical Abolitionists, that he asserts that the measure would have been constitutional, and upbraids the Democratic Legislature for neglecting to act upon his suggestion! Something to be pondered by anti-slavery men who are exhorted to vote for the "more favorable party of the two."

THE APPEAL.

Extracts from C. M. Clay's Appeal to the citizens of Madison County.

From The Louisville Journal.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF MADISON COUNTY: Learning from a reliable source that the Revolutionary Committee of Madison are about to meet in Richmond again, on next Monday, to take into consideration who are to be proscribed, and having understood that I only escaped their denunciation last Tuesday by a small majority, and that I am again to be considered on Monday, I avail myself of this means of making my protest and defense.

I would greatly prefer always to meet my accusers face to face, and there make my defense; but, as friends have insisted on my avoiding any pretense for a conflict, I yield to their wishes, and make this written appeal. In the first place, I, as a free citizen of a Constitutional Commonwealth, most solemnly protest against any power on earth but the legal and regularly constituted authorities of my country to decide in any manner upon my "life, liberty, or property." I regard, all impartial men will regard, him as the worst enemy of true liberty who acquiesces in any usurpation, on the part of any man or set of men, of the sovereign power of the State. If every man in Madison was to assent to the usurpation, it would be none the less an overthrow of the Constitution which can be annulled, set aside, changed, or disobeyed with impunity only by the legal representatives of the people in Convention assembled. But, according to the known facts, but about a fourth of the county signed the papers protesting against the doctrines and action of the "Radical Abolitionists," the Rev. John G. Fee and others. And it is well known that a very large number of those signing that paper were and are utterly opposed to any other than legal proceedings against those unhappy men, women, and children. So that the Committee have not the show of authority, three-fourths of the county hav-

ing absolutely refused, amid threats of intimidation on the part of the movers, to sanction their illegal action. But, waiving all these considerations, I do not fear to plead to you, on the merits of my cause. If it was a crime to resist the will and action of this revolutionary movement, I have not done even that, except by the high moral power of an earnest protest, refusing to join by force of arms in a common defense with the exiles. My reasons for this are these: I regarded the radical doctrine that "there is no law for Slavery" as revolutionary.

To deny the potency of the Constitution and the laws is to set up an independent government in opposition to the existing government and laws, the two necessary policies and jurisdictions of which must inevitably at least come into physical conflict. And while I am opposed to Slavery on all possible grounds, my love and respect for my constitution and my country override all other political considerations. My theory is, that Slavery is a creature of law, and the subject of support, modification, increase, or destruction, as any other policy, and to be reached in the same way only—by moral suasion, by speech, by the press, by the laws, and by the Constitution. That so long as it constitutes property, by laws—that the laws must be respected and enforced in good faith. That the majority have the right to rule, because we know of no other better way of promoting the ends of government, the safety and happiness of the whole of the governed. That if the slaveholders thus rule we will acquiesce—and if we thus rule they must also acquiesce. And therefore the Republicans in Kentucky have been opposed to, and have steadily denounced, any illegal interference with slaves, from home, at home, or abroad; they have given no countenance to the escape of slaves, to insubordination, or to servile insurrection. Hence, on the 4th of July, 1856, at the State Lick Springs, in this county, when the Rev. John G. Fee avowed from the stump the Radical Abolition doctrine, I denounced it from the stump. He was Corresponding Secretary of the Central Republican Club; at our first meeting in Richmond, he was displaced and a Republican elected in his stead. When he was mobbed in several places; when his collaborer the Rev. James S. Davis, asked my aid in defending Mr. Fee, I addressed a letter, dated Oct. 8, 1857, declining to identify myself in any way with Mr. Fee's doctrine or action. These letters were first published in *The Washington Republic* in the face of the world, and were republished in *The Louisville* and other Kentucky papers. Again, when the movement was made against the Bereans, I took the same neutral ground, in letters addressed to *The Richmond Messenger*, and to the Cincinnati papers, one only of which was published in *The Cincinnati Commercial*, dated White Hall, Ky., December 23, 1860, but which, I know not by what means, failed to reach Judge Field until the Monday following; and, the exiles being gone, I went into *The Messenger* Office, and took it away, as the occasion for its publication had passed. Again, when I heard that J. G. Hanson, one of the exiles, had returned, I went, on Friday last, to the House of Alexander McWilliams, where we talked the matter over, and we coincided in opinion, as we always had done, that our friends should separate their fortunes altogether from Hanson and his party. On Saturday, with John H. Rawlings, I went to Berea, and there used all my influence to persuade my Republican friends not to identify themselves at all in any manner with Hanson, but to ask him to sell his mill, and move from the State, as his presence would be a continual source of discontent, and might possibly involve the Republicans in a conflict, when innocent men might be killed. I stayed all night with William Snapp, where the same views were uttered and concurred in.

After stating somewhat more in detail, the doings of the mob, and of the defense made against them, as stated in his letters, Mr. Clay proceeds:

Here, men of Madison, are some of the facts, but not all the facts; the language to the daughter of West was too gross for the public eye, and I therefore suppress it; nor were these the only outrages. A similar offense to the children of the poor, brought on a revolution in that kingdom from which we draw our blood and our love of liberty. The story will sink deep into the hearts of thirty millions of Americans. The battle of the 29th day of March will never be forgotten in the annals of this nation!

You may drive these men into the mountains; you may burn their houses; you may hunt them down like wild beasts, till the last one falls by superior force; but their cause is the cause of American liberty, and of the noblest instincts of human nature. Their martyrdom will light up the fires of civil war, which will pervade the Union, and be extinguished only by the downfall of one or the other of those great powers, Liberty or Slavery, forever! Men of Madison, I stand by those men; I stand by the Constitution and laws of my native State; I stand by the Republican party everywhere; I stand by the liberties which I inherited from our fathers, and which my own blood has, from the beginning of the Revolution of 1776 to this hour, in every battle-field, been ready to defend. I stand, in a word, on my Frankfort speech of Jan. 10, 1860, which I desire to place before the world as the ground of my faith and of my action. I shall in no way whatever recognize or submit to any Revolutionary Committee. At my country's call I have freely risked my life in her defense; two years in exile from my home and family; nine months in a foreign pri-

son; ready at all times to sacrifice money, health, and even life itself, I have brought back an unsullied name to the place of my birth, and which you were not the last to welcome as part of the common glory of our State. You may be strong enough to overpower me; you cannot drive me from the duty which I owe to myself, to my friends, and to my country. If I fall, I trust I shall not fall in vain, and it will be enough for all my long cherished aspirations if, perchance, my blood shall atone for the wrongs of my race, and these States shall at last be free!

C. M. CLAY.
White Hall, Ky., Saturday, March 31, 1860.

The following, from the Mountain Democrat, Richmond, Ky., March 29th, will show how Mr. Clay's position is understood by that journal.

COL. CLAY'S REMARKS.

On Tuesday last, Col. C. M. Clay took occasion, on the adjournment of Court, to address his fellow citizens in relation to the events transpiring at Berea. The Colonel disclaimed any connection with the man Hanson or his doctrines, and said that he had so stated to Hanson. That he had told him (Hanson) that any man advocating the doctrines he held, could not live peaceably in this community, and advised him to leave this State. To this, Hanson replied that "every tub must stand upon its own bottom." Col. Clay disclaimed any connection with the Fee party, and stated that in the present deplorable state of events, he should stand neutral. He was quietly and respectfully listened to, by the crowd present.

MORE TROUBLE IN THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

Some time ago, the Annual Meeting of the Society of the Church of the Puritans, of which the Rev. Dr. Cheever is Pastor, was held, when an election took place for three Trustees. The opposition, consisting of several gentlemen engaged in the disposal of dry goods, &c., had succeeded in drumming up a number of persons to vote, who, it is said, were entitled to do so, for two gentlemen prominent in the opposition to the Pastor and the majority of the Church and congregation. Mr. Abernethy, the Treasurer of the Church, upon that occasion, stood at the table beside the Inspectors of Election, and challenged almost every member of the Church or congregation whom he knew to be favorable to Dr. Cheever.

In due time, the Inspectors counted the votes, and declared through the Chairman of the meeting, Messrs. Hartt, Whiting, and Hall to be the elected Trustees. Subsequently, however, when the Clerk of the Church, Mr. Berry, applied to the Inspectors for certificates of election, they declined granting them according to their own decision in presence of the Society, and afterward gave certificates to Messrs. Harvey and Tompkins, who had not been elected. It appears that some six or seven persons known to be friendly to Dr. Cheever were challenged by Mr. Abernethy, and prevented from voting by the Inspectors; while over a dozen persons who were well known to have left the Church, and who did not own pews nor hire sittings in the Church, were brought in as voters against Dr. Cheever and his friends.

Notwithstanding this reduction of the forces on the part of the supporters of the Church, and the increase of doubtful voters on the part of the enemies to the Church, the friends of the Pastor outvoted them and carried the election. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that the new Board of Trustees was to organize on Saturday evening, Mr. Edward Gilbert, the attorney acting in behalf of Messrs. Hartt, Whiting, and Hall, obtained from Justice B. W. Bonney of the Supreme Court an injunction restraining Messrs. Harvey and Tompkins from acting in the capacity of Trustees. The suit upon which the injunction was procured also institutes a claim for damages amounting to 5,000 and costs. These injunctions were served about half an hour previous to the meeting on Saturday night. The following statement of the case, and legal opinion in the premises, was handed to our reporter:

CASE.—An election for Trustees of the Church of the Puritans was held on the second Monday of this month by the members of that Religious Society, in pursuance of prior notice. Deacons White and Smith presided as Inspectors. There were two sets of candidates, and considerable challenging. Messrs. Hartt, Whiting, and Hall had thirty-three votes; Messrs. Harvey and Tompkins, thirty-one; and Mr. Bennett, twenty-seven votes. At the close of the election, and after canvassing the votes, the Inspectors announced publicly that Messrs. Hartt, Whiting and Hall were duly elected; and the Secretary of the meeting made an entry thereof in his minutes, and the meeting adjourned. Certificates of this election were not then given by the Inspectors; but they subsequently gave a certificate of election to the two candidates who had thirty-one votes, on the ground,

as is alleged, that some illegal votes were cast for those who had the majority vote. Upon this certificate these persons propose to act as Trustees; and our opinion is requested as to their right to do so.

OPINION.—Having considered the subject, we entertain no doubt, First, That Messrs. Hartt, Whiting, and Hall were and are the duly elected Trustees. They had the most votes, they were declared elected, and the Inspectors had no right, afterward, to declare any other persons elected, or to give them a certificate that they were elected. They exercised a quasi judicial office while acting as Inspectors during the election; and if they had excluded any vote, then, their decision, however erroneous it may have been, was final, and could only have been set aside by a Court of competent jurisdiction; but when the voting was closed, and they had declared the result, their power over the election, and as to receiving, or excluding votes ended, and nothing was left for them to perform but the mere ministerial act of making their certificate of what they had declared as the result of the election, as required by law. Beyond this everything was without authority and a gross usurpation. The election, as declared by them at the time, determined the rights of all parties until the adjudication of some Court should set aside that election as unlawful. Their certificate does not confer the right to act as Trustees: the election alone can do that; the certificate to the persons duly declared elected is only evidence of the right; but it is no evidence whatever to those who were defeated and so declared, and who knew it when they received it.

Second. Messrs. Hartt, Whiting and Hall are the only persons entitled to act as Trustees, and if the other parties assume to act as such, they are guilty of a violation of the law and a breach of moral duty. Third. Should they threaten to act as Trustees, and to take their seats in the Board as such, we have no doubt they may be restrained by an injunction from so doing; and that, in the suit in which that preventive remedy may be obtained, Messrs. Hartt, Whiting and Hall may obtain a judgment setting aside the illegal certificate given to the minority, and punish them and the Inspectors in costs and damages.

NEW YORK, March 29, 1860. WM. CURTIS NOYES.
WILLIAM TRACY.

At 7½ o'clock on Saturday evening, the meeting of the New Board convened in the Infant School room belonging to the Church.

Mr. Abernethy without being elected, took the Chair and assumed all the prerogatives of Chairman. Dr. Hartt protested against any person occupying the Chair unless duly elected thereto. Very soon the conflict rose to a boiling pitch, and Mr. Abernethy sent Mr. Tompkins one of the enjoined gentlemen for a policeman. Mr. T. accordingly left the room and was proceeding with great haste up Fifteenth street, when he was pursued by an officer who saw him run out of the lecture room, and who thought he might have been guilty of some offense against the law. When the officer caught him, the following conversation ensued.

Officer—What's the matter?

Tompkins—(out of breath)—O, I am after an Officer.

Officer—Well, I've been after you; what is it?

Tompkins—Then come with me, we want you to protect the law, up at the Church.

As the officer and Tompkins came up to the place of meeting, they encountered Capt. Bennett of the Eighteenth Ward Police, who, anxious to find out what was wanted, accompanied the officer and Tompkins to the room where the meeting was being held. Our reporter having just arrived, was following in the train of the Police, but Mr. Tompkins told him he was not wanted, and he must not come up the stair. Our reporter told Mr. Tompkins he must follow the Police Officers wherever they went, and he followed them into the meeting.

Mr. Abernethy invited the captain and his officer to take a seat; by his side sat Councilor Chester, also insisting that the officers should make themselves at home. At the same time, Dr. Hart and other gentlemen were protesting against such irregular proceedings.

Mr. Berry asked Mr. Chester, whether, if the inspectors had granted certificates to Horace Greely or James Gordon Bennett, they could have acted as Trustees of the Church of the Puritans?

Mr. Chester replied, undoubtedly they could.

Capt. Bennett was of opinion that he could not make himself at home just there, and with his subordinate officer, left.

As our reporter was leaving the room with the officers, Mr. Abernethy, addressing himself to Dr. Hart, and Mr. Hall, said, "I'll make you mind me." Finding all their purposes balked, however, the Abernethy party also came to the conclusion to leave. In order to do this, Councilor Chester moved to adjourn. The motion was declared car-

ried, but Dr. Fairbanks called for the yeas, and nays; and before the Clerk had time to finish the calling of the roll, Mr. Abernethy declared the meeting adjourned and, with Councilor Chester, Mr. Southmead, Mr. Rigney, Mr. Harvey, and Mr. Tompkins, left the meeting.

As they passed into the Street, Mr. Harvey observed to Councilor Chester, that this would be settled in the court.

After leaving the meeting a quorum having been left in the room, Messrs. Berry, Hartt, Whiting, Hall and Fairbanks, proceeded to business, electing Dr. Fairbanks as Chairman of the Board, Mr. Berry as Clerk, and Dr. Hart as Treasurer. The Board also proceeded to appoint Committees, and adjourned.

The case pending on the injunctions, restraining Messrs. Harvey and Tompkins from acting as Trustees, will be heard in the Supreme Court, on the 16th inst.

Meantime, the gentlemen claiming to be the properly and legally elected Trustees, are manging the business of the Church.—Tribune.

FOREIGN.

THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA AND THE SERFS.

A letter from St. Petersburg of March 13, supplies us with the text of the Emperor Alexander's reply to the Deputies from the Committee for emancipating the serfs. The Emperor says:

"Gentleman: I shall begin by once more expressing gratitude to the three Governments of Lithuania, which instigated the discussion of this interesting question. I think it necessary to repeat to you, gentlemen, what the Marshals who are among you have already learned from me. You are aware, gentlemen, how much this affair interests me, and how much it affects my heart; and I am certain that it is as dear to you as it is to me. I have but one object—the happiness of my Empire, and I am convinced that you have no other. I desire that the improvement of the condition of the peasants may shortly become an accomplished fact, and that this reform may be effected without violence. But that cannot be obtained without certain sacrifices on your part. My desire is to render these sacrifices as little onerous as possible to the nobility. I have caused a sketch of your labors in the capital to be prepared, and your duties are defined in it in a positive manner. You have been summoned here to reply to the questions which shall be addressed to you. Moreover, if you consider it necessary to add your own propositions and your personal opinions, you can do so officially, and I shall be informed of them. Act, then, in accord, animated by one single feeling—the public good. I know that absurd reports have been circulated, which have probably reached your ears. It was pretended that the nobility had lost my confidence. It is false; pay no attention to these reports, but place your faith in me.

"At the commencement, I addressed myself to the nobility; in full confidence I now address myself to you, with the same belief that you will realize my expectations. The Minister of the Interior, and Count Panin, whom I named President of the Commission in place of Gen. Roskoff, know my ideas and my manner of viewing this question. They can communicate them to you in detail. Your duty, gentlemen, is to second us, and I advise you to invoke the Divine protection."

Then, turning towards Count Panin, the Emperor added: "I present to you your colleagues. I am convinced that they will set themselves seriously to work. I request of you to bring this affair to a conclusion in a prudent and serious manner, without, however, too long delaying the solution. Adieu, gentlemen; I wish you success."

ITALY.

The great facts in the news from Europe are the annexation to Sardinia of Central Italy and the Romagna on the one hand, and of Savoy and Nice to France on the other. It appears that Nice is not anxious for the transfer, but there is no doubt that it will be arranged, notwithstanding.

Thus the French Emperor extends the boundaries of his dominions on the side of the Alps to what are called the natural limits. This gives him the command of the passes of the Alps leading into Piedmont, and puts Switzerland in a great measure, at his mercy.

The treaty for the cession of Savoy to France was published, but its features were already known.

It was reported that Switzerland will protest against French occupation, civil or military, of Chablais and Faucigny.

There were rumors of a probable Congress on the Swiss question.

The Pope had issued the act of major excommunication against all who counseled rebellion, invasion or usurpation in the Romagna, and had sent a protest to all the Governments against the annexation of the Legations to Sardinia.

In the F. favor of the which a ma the petition

The follo the Press.

Friday I the Epis the excom anination ment was ta ni (still abs Saturday— informed of ited the pub ceived the re to appear to rest for the does not app I have be elined not to of this ponti

The Swi The follow ed to the Fre

"M. KERN, Minister of "MONSIEUR patch from Federal Court Majesty the the mainten confirmed by erland, in so territory of S "I am to a lar manner Chablais, Fau in contradic which guaran neutrality, as tion, and decl (Switzerland "In the me tions which I which you we March, my in ing formally, every measur provinces to K to which the it would subm "I avail my

Corresponden

Young Joe to take upon Church, with in Utah, are a Conference, h et, and was a The Mormo A. M., and oc this preaching the Church in Young and his gamy was cep and as being t

Do THEY BU urday, March Woodfolk, on for the murder that, and the a "His fate was citizens.

The persons were arraigne tempted kidn gave bail in the term of the Sup

The Boston born are about

In the French Senate a vote, prompted by petitions in favor of the temporal power of the Pope, had been taken, by which a majority of that body appear to be unfavorable to the petitions.

The Excommunication of the King of Sardinia.

The following letter from Turin, of March 18, appears in the Press.

"Friday last the Episcopal Court of Turin, as likewise all the Episcopal Courts of the Kingdom, received the text of the excommunication pronounced by Rome, on account of the annexation of the Romagnas. On Friday evening this document was taken by the grand-vicars of Monsignore Fransoni (still absent at Lyons) to the Minister of Justice. On Saturday—that is, yesterday—the Council of State, duly informed of it, declared the bull null and void, and prohibited the publications of it, on account of its not having received the royal *exequatur*. It is said that a decree is about to appear to this effect. This rumor, which has been current for the last four-and-twenty hours among the public, does not appear to me to make any impression.

I have been assured that the clergy were previously inclined not to resist the prohibition against the publication of this pontifical document.

The Swiss Protest Against the annexation of Savoy.

The following is a copy of the Swiss protest just delivered to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs:

PARIS, March 15, 1860.

"M. KERN, Minister of Switzerland, to M. DE THOUVENEL, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE.—In a consequence of a dispatch from Berne I am to inform your Excellency that the Federal Council have addressed to the Government of his Majesty the King of Sardinia a note in which they demand the maintenance of the stipulations of the treaty of 1564, confirmed by the treaty of 1815 between Sardinia and Switzerland, in so far as they relate to the cession of the actual territory of Savoy to another Power.

"I am to add that my Government regards in a particular manner any annexation of the neutralized Provinces, Chablais, Faucigny, and the Genevois, to another power, as in contradiction to the stipulations of the treaty of 1815, which guarantee these Provinces, in the interest of Swiss neutrality, as if they were an integral part of the Confederation, and declaring that they are to enjoy the neutrality of Switzerland in the same manner as if they belonged to her."

"In the mean time, and with reference to the considerations which I had the honor to explain to you in the audience which you were good enough to grant me on the 13th of March, my instructions impose on me the duty of protesting formally, in the name of the Swiss Confederation, against every measure which may have for object to annex these provinces to France, till such time as the powers of Europe, to which the Imperial Government has itself declared that it would submit this question, shall have decided.

"I avail myself of this occasion, &c., "KERN."

Split among the Mormons.

Correspondence of the New York Times.

AMBOY, Ill., Friday April 6, 1860.

Young Joe Smith has at length acceded to the proposal, to take upon himself the place of his father in the Mormon Church, with a view to clear it of those enormities, which in Utah, are so disgracing to humanity. This day, at the Conference, he offered himself for acceptance as the Prophet, and was accepted.

The Mormon Conference assembled at this place at 10 A. M., and occupied the morning in preaching. Much of this preaching consisted in denunciation of the apostasy of the Church in Utah, and the evils promulgated by Brigham Young and his satellites, were vigorously attacked. Polygamy was especially adverted to, as being the great evil, and as being the evidence of the falling away of the Saints.

DO THEY BURN NEGROES?—The Vicksburgh Sun of Saturday, March 31st, says that a negro man belonging to Mr. Woodfolk, on Deer Creek, was recently burned at the stake for the murder of a Negro woman. All the negroes on that, and the adjoining plantations witnessed the burning. His fate was decreed by a council of highly respectable citizens.

The persons who attempted to arrest Mr. F. B. Sanborn, were arraigned at Boston yesterday, on a charge of attempted kidnapping. They waived an examination, and gave bail in the sum of \$2000 each, to appear at the next term of the Superior Court.

The Boston Journal says: "The friends of Frank B. Sanborn are about to present his sister—as a token of their re-

spect for her bravery—one of the latest style of Colt's revolvers. It will bear an engraved representation of the old Pine Tree flag, and the inscription, 'Sic itur ad astra!'"

SEXTONVILLE, Richland Co., Wis., April 3, 1860.

On the night of April 2, the house of Mrs. Ragan, in this county, while she was absent over night at a neighbor's, was burned to the ground, and six children perished in the flames. The largest was 11 years of age. They were all the children she had. Mrs. R. lost her husband about three months ago.

Mr. Summer laid before the United States Senate the memorial of Mr. Sanborn respecting the late brutal attempt to kidnap him by the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms of that body. The case was postponed till the return of the process, when we have no doubt it will receive the thorough exposition it requires.

Family Miscellany.

For The Principia.

ANCHOR WATCH, IN THE STRAITS OF SUND.

A MARINER'S SONG.

Now sweetly rests our anchor'd barque,
Beside Sumatra's isle,
And Neptune's slippery tricks to mark,
Befalls my task, awhile.

Alternate vigils seamen keep,
And thus, in duty bound,
At midnight hour, while others sleep,
I walk my lonely round,

And listen to the hollow moan
That creeps along the shore,
The winds that through the forests groan,
The sea's continuous roar.

And distant thunders join the sound,
And vivid lightnings play,
Mid the stupendous mountains round,
Commencing night with day.

Along the beach, the rude Malay,
Kindling his beacons high,
Thus rudely says, or seems to say
He will our wants supply.

The restless sea swells deeper, now,
The tide runs swiftly out,—
"How tends the cable from the bow?
A longer scope run out."

And oft I cast a jealous eye,
O'er quarter, beam, or bow,
Fearful, along the coast to spy
Some hovering pirate prow.

A sand-glass measures out the time,
The sea-boy marks it well,
And each half-hour adds to the chime
Of his repording bell.

And hark! eight bells proclaim the hour,
Of hours, board ship, the best;
The other watch comes into pow'r,
And mine retires to rest.

E. L. E.

For "The Principia."

CHAPTERS TO YOUNG MEN.

ON HOW TO WIN A WIFE.

CHAPTER I.

Come, young man, it is your turn now! You of the sterner sex are continually treating the girls to lectures, of all descriptions, long or short, prosy or spicy, as the case may be. One can scarcely stumble over a book or paper that doesn't contain one of them—setting forth the imperative necessity of their being just the most lovely, sensible, modest, intelligent, aspiring, practical, innocent, wise, intellectual, housewife, unpretending, tasty, capable, pleasing, profound, and sunny little beings imaginable; also stating that they must always be perfectly amiable, sweet, and self-possessed, in every relation and condition of life that can be known or mentioned, if they are to entertain any hope of winning your most valuable esteem and affection.

All this is very well, but did it never occur to you that young men need some excellent qualifications, if they expect to win the esteem and affection of young ladies? Such an idea has occurred to us more than once. Why, my dear

sir, do you expect one of these ready-made angels is going to drop right into your arms, just at the asking, and give herself up to you in implicit faith? Do you suppose a being so full of sweetness, goodness, purity, saintliness, is going to love a common-place individual like yourself? No wonder you discourse so affectingly on the excellence of a perfectly trusting, confiding nature, in woman. The necessity of the case requires it. But do you really believe that such a compound of nearly all the virtues will be destitute of the very essential ones of judgment and good taste, for your benefit? Do you believe your angels are such consummate dunces? If you do, you will find out your mistake before you have done with it.

You have drawn your ideal—you have done well; now mate it, and you will do better. If Ellen must be up with the sun, singing around the house like a bird and working like a bee, her hair all smooth and shining, her dress perfectly neat and tidy, and her face wreathed in smiles, do you believe she will be likely to fall in love with a young man who stumbles out of bed after the second breakfast bell, and two or three knocks on the door by his grandmother, puts himself hastily to rights, and comes down stairs with hair representing every point in the compass, and some points not in the compass, and a face expressive of anything but tranquility of mind? Not a bit of it! If she goes to stay all night with his sister, some night when he is away and not coming home till late, (that is the way to work it, girls!) and the morning produces such developments, it is all over with him. If Ellen must be always perfectly amiable and sunny to her mamma, and respectful and attentive to papa, do you think she will ever entertain the least regard for a young man who doesn't show similar marks of filial affection? If she is always so gentle and considerate to little brothers and sisters, helping Johnny about his sums and fixing Willie's kite, and mending Susie's torn dress, without ever getting impatient, do you suppose that you, who push Charlie one side, and tell Eddie to get out of the way, and Minnie not to bother, will command her esteem and reverence? If she loves her older brother with true sisterly devotion, denying herself to send him to college, and entering with hearty interest into all his plans and pursuits, will she admire the young gentleman who gets all he can out of his sister and then says, "Oshaw!" when she desires a little brotherly affection and kindness; who invariably brings his torn coats and loose shirt buttons to her, yet leaves her at home (if she doesn't happen to have a beau) while he goes off to the concert with another girl? No, young man; no sensible girl will love you at that rate. Be kind to your sister. All the girls know that a good brother will make a good husband. If you are true and faithful in present relations, there is good ground to believe you will be in future ones. A certain young lady once fell in love with a young gentleman, just from observing his kind attentions to his sister, when he didn't know that anybody was looking at him. He is married now, and I know that sweet little Ella—has got one of the best, noblest husbands a woman ever had!

You say the wife you would choose must be a neat, tidy, housekeeper, must make home pleasant and cheerful, and keep everything in its proper place, and all bright and shining. Are you sure such a girl will select for a husband one who comes into the house without cleaning his boots, throws his overcoat into a chair, his hat in one corner, and various bundles promiscuously on table and sofa? You say she must be economical; must know how to save money; do you know how to get it?

You say she whom you would choose, must possess the requisite qualifications for making home happy. Now, what is home? What does it mean? Of what does it consist? Is home only a place to stay in? No: for then you might be content to stay with your parents, or board, or get a house and hire a housekeeper. But none of these places would seem home to you. And why? Why, because you want a snug little place of your own, with somebody in it whom you love better than all the world, and who loves you better than all the world—that makes home! Now doesn't she want a companion capable of making her home happy, as well as you? And are you the one? Sure of it?

And you want a woman who is strong. Yes, yes; even you—man—strong, stern, brave, fearless, man, who are always talking about the oak and ivy, and how frail and delicate woman is, and what a beautiful thing it is to have

somebody to cherish, and protect, and defend! All very fine in fair weather, when no protection and defense is needed, but when the storm of adversity comes, you want her to be strong, and stand up, bravely, and face it, with you, and aid, and cheer, and strengthen and encourage you, if you are likely to fall. Yes: she must be strong! But will a woman of so much strength, and depth of character esteem a man who has not some "pluck?" Will she?

Now I trust you have opened your eyes to the fact that a man has got to be something, if he is going to win something. Next week I mean to take up the subject more systematically; this present chat being only a little preliminary shake, just to wake you up and set you thinking.

Dangers of Emulation as a Motive to Study.

The intellectual form of selfishness is emulative ambition: a radical disorder in our schools and our scholarship. Let me tell you what I have seen in our Christian New England: two brilliant, light-hearted youths, the rival leaders of their class, all the rest left behind, stretching across the four years' course neck and neck, stimulated by the spur of an eager emulation, sacrificing health and peace, only to drop one into a grave and the other into mental perversion; at the end of the heat; this instead of that noble spectacle—both striving generously together, for wisdom's own immortal and unbounded good, each rejoicing in the other's gains, and then both standing, nay kneeling rather, gratefully, together, on the summit both have reached. We put our pupils too much on this race, not that they may attain a common good, but that they may outstrip each other. To be wise, to be strong, to be masters of life, wielders of bright weapons against all ignorance and wrong,—this is not made the aim,—but the poor complacency of looking back on the rest. A hateful fire is set running through the fresh growths of these unscathed breasts, which scorches, blights, and blackens, whenever its hot tongue can find a generous feeling to singe. "Paint me," said the boy Chatterton, to an artist who asked him for a design: "paint me an angel with trumpet and wings, to publish my name over the world!" Plagiarism, madness, suicide, were the horrible chapters of his biography. Why talk of following knowledge for its own sake, if our practice teaches children to prize it only as a ladder to renown, or as a price paid for applause? But my friends, the moment you carry your objections to the conductors of education, they tell you the emulative plan is the only one that the previous management of their scholars allows them to use, with the least hope of getting out of them any tolerable amount of work. That is to say, the trail of the serpent runs all the way, from alphabet to diplomas:—and who knows how far beyond? Prior once proposed a system of education, by having sweet cakes cut out in the shape of the letters,—the child to eat a letter as soon as he had learnt it,—and so on, till he had devoured and digested this baked alphabet. One is reminded of this philosophy of compound nourishment, when he sees little children made to think that the only purpose of learning is to be fattened, whether on cake, money, or compliments. Suppose rather that from the beginning of his studies, the boy were made to feel that the grand object of them is usefulness to society and the service of God. Suppose the question put foremost by the voice of father and mother, teachers and tutor, were, how to learn to contribute the largest life to the welfare of man, and so how to help others to live; how to lighten the load of the wronged and oppressed; how to raise burdens, and cheer outcasts, and render science the minister to overtaken strength, and turn discovery to the relief of sorrow:—

"How best to help the slender store,
How mend the dwellings of the poor,
How gain in life, as life advances,
Valor and Charity, more and more."

The mind can never open into its largest compass and power, under any, but the broadest and highest motives. Nor can it ever be too soon to expand it by that Christian measure.—Prof. Huntington.

The habits of emulation contracted by literary men, continue through life, and lie at the basis of half the political, ecclesiastical and theological feuds that rend Society into rival parties, sects, and schools, under the leadership of ambitious men, desirous of thus attaining distinction.—We once heard a prominent New-England minister exclaim—"Oh

that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep, day and night, over the desolations occasioned by literary, theological, and ecclesiastical rivalry, among the ministers of New-England!"

We highly value genuine independence of thought and of utterance, growing out of an honest desire to ascertain and propagate truth, to detect and expose error. But it is sad to think that under guise of this, there frequently creeps into the heart, sometimes unperceived, the desire to obtain a name, by introducing something new.—Editor.

OUR ANCESTORS.

We are told—"every man has two parents, four grand-parents, eight great grand parents, sixteen great great grand parents &c. If we reckon thirty years to a generation, and carry on the above series to the time of the Norman conquest, it will be found that each of us must have had at that period no less than 32,000,000 of ancestors. Now, making all the allowances for crossing the genealogical lines, and consequently for the same person being in many of the intersections, still there will remain a number sufficient at that period to cover the whole Norman and Anglo-Saxon race. Whatever, therefore, was then noble, or pious, or princely, or even kingly, stands, somewhere in the line of ancestry. Each man of the present day may be almost certain of having had not only earls but even crowned heads among his progenitors. And so also may we be almost assured that the highest families of that period have now lineal representatives in persons so low in the social scale, that all the sounding lines of heraldry would fail to fathom their obscurity. It is a consequence, too, of the same view, that a thousand years hence, each man who has now an ordinary family of children will probably have a representative, some way, of his blood in each one of 30,000,000 of persons; and that these will be of all conditions, high and low, rich and poor, unless, as may be the case, some system of social philosophy may, long before that, have swept all distinctions from our world."—Selected.

These facts suggest the moral, religious, political, and social benefits of full and continuous genealogies of families, such as were kept by the children of Israel. As preventives of aristocracies, castes, family pride, national antipathy arrogance on the one hand and servility on the other, they are invaluable. Could slavery long survive the effects of a truthful public record of the genealogies of slaveholders and slaves?—ED. PRINCIPIA.

"REMEMBER THOSE IN BONDS."

We want all our young readers to remember the poor slaves.

If there were ever sufferers that claimed our sympathy and prayers, they are the outraged and abused slaves. Many of them are whipped, half starved, unmercifully worked, sold and transported from all their friends to distant and strange places: Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, and Sisters, all parted, never to see each other again in this world: Deprived of the Bible and all other books—not allowed to have any of their earnings, and if they attempt to flee, as the word of God allows them to do, they are hunted and torn by dogs, and shot with guns, and often killed.

These are some of the evils of slavery—the slavery of this country, and the slavery that Church members practice. Of all the cruelty, meanness, outrageousness, and ungodliness that exists in this lower world, this American slavery is the very chiefest. Mr. Wesley said, only four days before he died, that it was "the vilest that ever saw the sun." Any one that will be a slave-holder in this land of Bibles, is not fit to live out of a prison, surely. And yet many of them are members of Churches! An account lately published, states that the members of the different Churches in this country, claim to own 468,000 slaves! O, horrible! Can persons hold slaves and be Christians? Could some rich and unfeeling people about in your neighborhood own you and your parents, and sell you from each other, and make you work without pay, and give you "a peck of corn a week" to live upon, and be Christians? Could they?

And then, after all that has been said about the fitness of enslaving the Africans, and their enduring the severities of slavery, this great falsehood is being exposed every day. A young girl was recently brought into the Sabbath School of Mr. Beecher's Church, in Brooklyn, N. Y., and her freedom purchased for \$800, who was as white as any one in that congregation. She was one-sixteenth African only.

So that any little child can see that the slave-holders would as readily enslave white people as colored, if they could, and are really doing it. And, to say nothing about the unchristian character of this evil, those who practice it are the meanest and most scandalous of all human beings. They deserve both the pity and scorn of every human heart.—Wesleyan.

DEFINITION OF A POISON.—"A poison," says Webster, "is any agent capable of producing a morbid, noxious, or dangerous effect upon anything endowed with life." We, therefore, characterize that assemblage of "morbid," "noxious," and "dangerous effects" which we have shown to be produced by alcohol, as products of poisoning.

The familiar terms of universal speech bear a witness upon this point. When persons have taken sufficient alcohol to affect them, they are said to be intoxicated, the literal meaning of which is *poisoned*. The word is derived from *toxicum*, the Latin for *poison* from which we have the word *toxicology*, which signifies the science which treats of poisoning and poisons. We have also *toxic*, agents which mean poisons, and *intoxication*, which signifies the state or condition of being poisoned. This state is, however, limited, by general acceptance, to those "morbid," "noxious," and "dangerous effects" produced upon the nervous system, which are accompanied by mental disturbance, delirium, or frenzy. Furthermore, it may be observed that alcohol is universally ranked among poisons by physiologists, chemists, physicians, toxicologists, and all who have experimented, studied, and written upon the subject, and who, therefore, best understand it.—Youmans on Alcohol.

What should be thought of granting licences to carry on the business of poisoning people?—Ed.

EVERY DAY EXAGGERATION.—"I am tired to death!" So you have said often, and are alive still, and in good health too.

"I have not had a wink of sleep all night." And yet your bed fellow heard you snore several times.

"I would not do it for the world." And yet you have done many things equally as well, for a penny.

"We were up to our knees in mud." You know very well that the dirt was not over shoe.

A man's religious convictions should be a part of himself, not like a harness, which you can take off from the horse and lay aside for a while and then put on again, when you wish to, but like a man's lungs, which you can't take out of the man but he dies.

The following is the whole of an article in the *Presbyterian Herald*: KEEP IT BEFORE THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.—That the great want of the Churches of the present day is, not talented preachers, but pious pastors.

THE USURPATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE!—\$300.—The undersigned offers the following prizes: \$200 for the best Legal Essay, and \$100 for the best Popular Essay on the following questions, viz:

- I. In what, if any, cases, does the Constitution permit the Senate of the United States to coerce witnesses for information to merely aid legislation?
- II. In what, if any, cases, does the Constitution permit the Senate of the United States to seize and force witnesses from their States to merely aid legislation?
- III. In what, if any, cases, does the Constitution permit the Senate of the United States to investigate alleged crime to merely aid legislation?

The Essays must not exceed 40 pages octavo "long primer" type, and are required by the Committee (whose address will be published hereafter), on the 1st day of June, 1860. The award will be pronounced on or before 1st July following.

Papers of all parties, and of no party, but who favor fair play and free discussion, are respectfully solicited to publish this notice. The Essays will be sent to all who forward me marked copies of their papers containing the above. Address "care of Army, box No. 699, Georgetown, D. C."

THADDEUS HYATT.

Washington Jail, March 28, 1860.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols. \$1.50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol. \$1.00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol. \$0.75
TERMS CASH.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.